IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

5

———————————————————————

In re application of: Aaron James GANNON	Group Art Unit: 2672
Serial No.: 10/646,901	Examiner: E. V. Woods
Filed: August 22, 2003	Confirmation No.: 1338

10

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR CHANGING THE RELATIVE SIZE OF A
       DISPLAYED IMAGE

Docket No.: H0003570

15   Customer No.: 000128

———————————————————————

20   **APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.37**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
25   P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

       Appellant hereby submits its Appeal Brief in response to the final rejection of the

30   subject patent application.

       The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz PC

Deposit Account No. 50-2091, $500 for the filing of this Appeal Brief.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   Introduction

This is an Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 appealing the rejections set forth in the fifth Office action of record dated March 20, 2007. Each of the topics required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 is presented in this Brief and is labeled appropriately.

5

II. <u>Real Party in Interest</u>

Honeywell International, Inc. ("Honeywell") is the real party in interest of the present application. An assignment of all rights in the present application to Honeywell was executed by the inventors and recorded by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at

5   **Reel 014444, Frame 0038**.

III.   Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no appeals or interferences related to the present application of which Appellant is aware.

5

IV.   Status of Claims

Claims 1-4, 8-24, and 28-44, which are presented in the Claims Appendix, are pending in the application. Each of Claims 1-4, 8-24, and 28-44 have been at least twice rejected and, as indicated in the Claims Appendix, each of Claims 5-7 and 25-28 have
5   been canceled. Accordingly, the Appellant hereby appeals the rejections of Claims 1-4, 8-24, and 28-44.

V. Status of Amendments

Following a fourth Office action of record, dated October 31, 2006, Appellant

filed a Response, dated December 28, 2006. In response to this, a fifth, non-final Office

action was mailed March 20, 2007. In response to this most recent Office action,

5   Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal.

The subject matter of independent Claim 1 relates to a method (300) of changing the relative size of a displayed image (204) in a display (108) including one or more edges (206) that define a display area (202) in which at least a portion of an image including an edge point (508) is displayed (FIGS. 3A, 3B). The method comprises selecting a zoom point (402) in the displayed image (204) (pg. 8, ll. 3-7; FIG. 3A, 4). The zoom point (402) corresponds to a point in the displayed image (202) that is to be zoomed, and the image edge point (508) is located at a position on the display area edge (306) that coincides with an edge point (506) on the display area (506) (pg. 8, ll. 15-19; FIGS. 4, 5). The relative size of the selected zoom point (402) is changed while: (i) translating the selected zoom point (402) along a straight zoom line (504) that passes through the selected zoom point (402) and extends between a central point (210) in the display area (202) and the display area edge point (506) (pg. 8, ll. 16-18; pg. 8, l. 27 through pg. 9, l. 11; FIGS. 2, 6-10) and (ii) maintaining the position of the image edge point (508) such that the image edge point (508) remains coincident with the display area edge point (506) (pg. 9, ll. 12-15; FIGS. 6-10).

The subject matter of independent Claim 21 relates to a display device (100) that comprises a user interface (102), a display screen (108), and a processor (104) (pg. 5, ll. 12-13; FIG. 1). The user interface (102) is operable to receive user input and to supply one or more command signals (pg. 5, ll. 13-15). The display screen (108) has a display area edge (206) that defines an image display area (202) in which a displayed image (204) may be rendered (pg. 7, ll. 1-11; FIG. 2). The displayed image (204) includes an edge point (508) located at a point on the display area edge (206) (pg. 8, ll. 15-19; FIGS.

4, 5). The processor (104) is coupled receive the commands from the user interface (102) (pg. 5, ll. 24-32) and is operable, in response thereto, to: (i) select a zoom point (402) in the displayed image (204) that corresponds to a point in the displayed image that is to be zoomed (pg. 8, ll. 3-7; FIG. 4); (ii) change the relative size of the selected zoom point (402) while translating the selected zoom point (402) along a straight zoom line (504) that passes through the selected zoom point (402) and extends between a central point (210) in the display area (202) and the display area edge point (206) (pg. 8, ll. 16-18; pg. 8, l. 27 through pg. 9, l. 11; FIGS. 2, 6-10); and (iii) maintain the position of the image edge point (508) while the relative size of the selected zoom point (402) is changing such that the image edge point (508) remains coincident with the display area edge point (506) (pg. 9, ll. 12-15; FIGS. 6-10).

The subject matter of independent Claim 41 relates to a method (300) of changing the relative size of a displayed image (204) in a display that includes one or more display area edges (206) that define a display area (202) in which at least a portion of an image (204) including a plurality of image points is displayed. The method comprises selecting a zoom point (402) in the displayed image (204) (pg. 8, ll. 3-7; FIGS. 3A, 4). The zoom point (402) corresponds to a point in the displayed image (204) that is to be zoomed (pg. 8, ll. 5-7). The relative size of the selected zoom point (402) is changed while: (i) translating the selected zoom point (402) along a straight zoom line (504) that passes through the selected zoom point (402) and extends between a central point (210) in the display area (202) and an edge point (506) on the display area (202) that is closest to the selected zoom point (402) (pg. 8, ll. 15-19; FIGS. 2, 6-10) and (ii) maintaining an

7

alignment of the image points with the display area edge (206) that includes the display area edge point (506) to which the zoom line (504) extends (pg. 9, ll14-28; FIGS. 6-11).

The subject matter of independent Claim 43 relates to a display device (100) that includes a user interface (102), a display screen (108), and a processor (104). The user interface (102) is operable to receive user input and to supply one or more command signals (pg. 5, ll. 13-15). The display screen (108) has one or more edges (206) that define an image display area (202) in which a displayed image (204) may be rendered (pg. 7, ll. 1-11; FIG. 2). The processor (104) is coupled receive the commands from the user interface (102) (pg. 5, ll. 24-32) and is operable, in response thereto, to: (i) select a zoom point (402) in the displayed image (204) that corresponds to a point in the displayed image (204) that is to be zoomed and (ii) change the relative size of the selected zoom point (402) while translating the selected zoom point (402) along a straight zoom line (504) that passes through the selected zoom point (402) and extends between a central point (210) in the display area (202) and an edge point (506) on the display area (202) that is closest to the selected zoom point (402) (pg. 8, ll. 15-19; FIGS. 2, 6-10). The displayed image (204) includes a plurality of image points aligned with the display area edge (206) that includes the display area edge point (506) to which the zoom line (504) extends. The processor (104) is further operable to maintain the alignment of each of the image points with the display area edge (206) that includes the display area edge point (506) while the relative size of the selected zoom point (402) is changing (pg. 9, ll.14-28; FIGS. 6-11).

VII.   Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The grounds of rejection to be reviewed in this appeal are as follows:

1.   Whether Claims 1-4, 8, 21-24, 28, and 41-44 are unpatentable under 35
U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0233222 (Lee et al.)
(Appellant notes that the Office action indicates that these claims are rejected over Lee et
al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,407,749 (Duke et al.); however, because Duke et al. is never
addressed in the heart of the rejection, it is assumed that the rejection is solely over Lee et
al.).

2.   Whether Claims 9, 11-19, 29, and 32-39 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C.
§ 103 over Lee et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,396,507 (Kaizuka et al.).

3.   Whether Claims 20 and 40 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over
Lee et al., Kaizuka et al., Duke et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,333,996 (Kato).

4.   Whether Claims 10 and 30 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over
Lee et al., Kaizuka et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,583,984 (Conrad et al.)

VIII.   <u>Arguments</u>

I.   CLAIMS 1-4, 8, 21-24, 28, AND 41-44 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE
     UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER <u>LEE ET AL.</u>

5

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of

obviousness. <u>In re Fine</u>, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Indeed, the Examiner has

the burden of setting forth a detailed evidentiary basis for the teaching, suggestion or

motivation to combine the cited references. Indeed, as the Supreme Court recently

10   reiterated, it is "important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of

ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new

invention does." <u>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</u>, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007).

A claim cannot be found *prima facie* obvious unless <u>all</u> of the claim elements are either

taught or suggested in the cited art or form part of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill

15   in the art, or all of claim elements are obvious from the nature of the problem itself. <u>In re</u>

<u>Dembiczak</u>, 175 F.3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (emphasis added); <u>In re Wilson</u>, 424 F.2d

1382, 1385 (C.C.P.A. 1970) ("All words in a claim must be considered in judging the

patentability of that claim against the prior art.").

Moreover, it is well-settled that, in order to avoid succumbing to the temptation of

20   reliance on hindsight, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must

not be found in an applicant's disclosure. <u>In re Vaeck</u>, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438

(Fed. Cir. 1991). Although it is recognized that any determination of obviousness is, in a

sense, based on hindsight reasoning, if the determination does not take into account only

knowledge within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made, but relies on knowledge gleaned only from an applicant's own disclosure, then hindsight has been impermissibly applied. In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 1395, 170 USPQ 209, 212 (CCPA 1971).

Appellant submits that the Examiner has not met his burden in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the prior art does not objectively teach or suggest all of the recited claim elements, nor are all the recited claim elements obvious from the nature of the problem itself. It is submitted that the Examiner is unwittingly relying on impermissible hindsight reasoning, albeit quit faulty reasoning, as will now be explained.

Independent Claims 1 and 21 each recite that, while zooming, the position of the image edge point is maintained such that the image edge point remains coincident with the display area edge point, and independent Claims 41 and 43 each recite maintaining an alignment of the image points with the display area edge that includes the display area edge point to which the zoom line extends.

Lee et al. relates to a system and method for controlling 3D computer model scaling in a 3D display system. When a zoom mode is activated, a model zoom point may be selected and a zoom scale factor may be set. In response to selection of the model zoom point and the setting of the scale factor, a zoom operation may be implemented to automatically move the selected model zoom point from its original position towards an optimum viewing point. Lee et al. also discloses that the system can automatically identify a model zoom point by applying defined rules to visible points of a displayed model that lie in a central viewing area. If no visible points are available the

11

system can prompt a user to move the model until such points become available, or can select a model and a zoom point on that model by an automatic scheme.

In the most recent Office action, the Examiner readily admits that <u>Lee et al. et al.</u> "does not expressly teach that image edge point remains coincident with the display area edge point (sic)." Office action of March 20, 2007 at 7. However, the Examiner then goes on to state that "if the entire screen in <u>Lee et al.'s</u> invention consists of the view volume or image, and thus the volume extends to the edges of the screen or beyond (as explained in the response to arguments), the image edge point would be coincident with the recited display edge point." <u>Id.</u> From this statement, the Examiner exercises some mental gymnastics that, quite honestly, Appellant cannot quite comprehend, and that are used to somehow provide a *prima facie* showing that the invention recited in independent Claims 1, 21, 41, and 43 is obvious. Specifically, the Examiner states that, based on the latter recited statement from the Office action, it would have been obvious to allow a user to utilize a full-screen mode to more effectively visualize a 3-D data set. The Examiner then goes on to state that, once this modification is made, "the display edge point would be coincident with the recited image edge point, and since the translation line would move the area the recited zoom point (MVP) towards the OVP (as in [0085-0089], 0027) the area around the recited zoom point would shift, but the original image edge point/display edge area point line would still exist, since clearly Figure 9 defines the line from the OVP through the MVP, and such a line would extend through the edge of the display, thusly the two would be forced to remain coincident." Id. at 7-8.

The undersigned generally does not make a habit of quoting lengthy passages from Office actions in appeal briefs. Here, however, it is believed necessary because the

undersigned would like either the Examiner or the Board to more clearly elucidate what these statements mean so that, perhaps, a potentially more lucid response may be provided (if indeed one is needed). The Examiner does make reference to his response to arguments in the March 20, 2007 Office action in one of the above-quoted statements.

5   Thus, the undersigned read and studied this portion of the Office action in hopes of better understanding the Examiner's position, so that a more rigorous response could be made to his position. Unfortunately, this section does not shed any light on the above-noted reasoning. However, as will now be shown, this portion of the Office action does indicate that the Examiner is completely ignoring explicit recitations in each of the

10   independent claims.

        The Examiner indicates, at page 2 of the March 20, 2007 Office action, that if the image disclosed in <u>Lee et al.</u> occupies at least the entire screen, then the image edge point will coincide with the display area edge point. <u>Id.</u> at 2. The Examiner then points out that if the image is translated along a zoom line, as illustrated in FIG. 9 of <u>Lee et al.</u>, the

15   most comfortable location of the zoomed image will be produced. The Examiner also quotes from paragraph [0086] of <u>Lee et al.</u> that this zooming is accomplished "while not losing the original layout for (sic) the larger context." What this statement has to do with anything eludes the undersigned. Nonetheless, the Examiner, after providing some definitions, then indicates that "the display area edge point will remain constant during

20   the scale operation." Id. at 3.

        Appellant, of course, does not disagree that the display area edge point remains constant in <u>Lee et al.</u>. Indeed, the display area edge points, as these points are clearly and unambiguously defined in the specification of the instant application, remain constant for

13

all types of displays. What is clearly novel and non-obvious about the instant invention is that, while zooming, the position of the **image edge point** is maintained such that the **image edge point** remains coincident with the display area edge point (Claims 1 and 21), and that an alignment of the **image points** with the display area edge that includes the

5   display area edge point to which the zoom line extends is maintained (Claims 41 and 43). Appellant has thoroughly studied the Office action, and cannot find these features addressed anywhere within the document. It is submitted that the reason for this is clear – this feature is not disclosed or suggested, either explicitly or implicitly, in any of the art of record, from the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or from the nature of the

10   problem itself.

In view of the foregoing, Appellant submits that <u>Lee et al.</u> fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claims 1, 21, 41, and 43. Moreover, because independent Claims 1, 21, 41, and 43 are non-obvious, then dependent Claims 2-4, 8, 22-24, 28, 42, and 44 are also nonobvious. <u>In re Fine</u>, supra.

15

II.   CLAIMS 9, 11-19, 29, AND 32-39 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE

UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER <u>LEE ET AL.</u> AND <u>KAIZUKA ET AL.</u>

20   The teachings of <u>Lee et al.</u> were described above, and will not be further repeated. As to <u>Kaizuka et al.</u>, this citation relates to a data extraction unit for extracting a portion of image data in response to a request from a client machine. In particular, in response to a request to enlarge a partial region of an image, only image data in the requested partial

14

region is dynamically extracted and transferred instead of transferring the entire file including the corresponding image data. As a result, the amount of data transferred is decreased.

While not conceding that Kaizuka et al. suggests what is alleged in the Office

5 action, Appellant nonetheless submits that this citation does not make up for at least the above-noted deficiencies of <u>Lee et al.</u> with respect to the independent claims. Because independent Claims 1 and 21 are nonobvious, then dependent Claims 9, 11-19, 29, and 32-39 are also nonobvious. <u>In re Fine</u>, supra.

10

III.   CLAIMS 20 AND 40 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C.
       § 103 OVER <u>LEE ET AL.</u>, <u>KAIZUKA ET AL.</u>, <u>DUKE ET AL.</u>, AND
       <u>KATO</u>

15   The teachings of <u>Lee et al.</u> and <u>Kaizuka et al.</u> were described above, and will not be further repeated. As to <u>Duke et al.</u>, this citation relates to a system and method for simultaneously scrolling and zooming displayed images in response to user input to a user interface. The system is configured to alternate between zooming in and zooming out at preset rates in response to successive user actuations of a device on the user

20 interface. <u>Kato</u> relates to a handwriting code processing device that enables reduced processing of an input device that recognizes the operability of writing utensils that paper and a pen produce by coding handwriting input by a user.

While not conceding that <u>Duke et al.</u> and <u>Kato</u> suggest what is alleged in the Office action, Appellant nonetheless submits that this citation does not make up for at least the above-noted deficiencies of <u>Lee et al.</u> with respect to the independent claims. Because independent Claims 1 and 21 are non-obvious, then dependent Claims 20 and 40

5   are also non-obvious. <u>In re Fine</u>, supra.

IV.   CLAIMS 10 AND 30 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C.
          § 103 OVER <u>LEE ET AL.</u>, <u>KAIZUKA ET AL.</u>, AND <u>CONRAD ET AL.</u>

10   The teachings of <u>Lee et al.</u> and <u>Kaizuka et al.</u> were described above, and will not be further repeated. As to <u>Conrad et al.</u>, this citation relates to a graphical user interface that allows a user to open and close enclosures, while dragging an object. More specifically, when a user pauses, gestures, or rolls over a hot spot on top of an icon or text that represents a closed enclosure, a temporary window for the closed enclosure is opened

15   to allow the user to browse inside the enclosure, and possibly open another enclosure contained within the temporary window. The user may close these opened windows by simply moving the cursor out of the opened window, or by making some other gesture.

While not conceding that <u>Conrad et al.</u> suggests what is alleged in the Office action, Appellant nonetheless submits that this citation does not make up for at least the

20   above-noted deficiencies of <u>Lee et al.</u> with respect to the independent claims. Because independent Claims 1 and 21 are non-obvious, then dependent Claims 10 and 30 are also non-obvious. <u>In re Fine</u>, supra.

IX.   CONCLUSION OF ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing, Appellant submits that the rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-24, and 28-44 is improper and should not be sustained. Therefore, a reversal of the rejections in the Office action dated March 20, 2007, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated August 13, 2007   By: /PAUL D. AMROZOWICZ, REG. NO. 45264/
                                          Paul D. Amrozowicz

Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz
Customer No. 29,906

17

X. CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claims on Appeal

1.   In a display including one or more edges that define a display area in which at least a portion of an image including an edge point is displayed, a method of changing the relative size of the displayed image, comprising the steps of:

selecting a zoom point in the displayed image, the zoom point corresponding to a point in the displayed image that is to be zoomed, the image edge point located at a position on the display area edge that coincides with an edge point on the display area; and

changing the relative size of the selected zoom point while (i) translating the selected zoom point along a straight zoom line that passes through the selected zoom point and extends between a central point in the display area and the display area edge point and (ii) maintaining the position of the image edge point such that the image edge point remains coincident with the display area edge point.

2.   The method of Claim 1, further comprising:

inhibiting any further change in relative size, and any further translation along the zoom line, when the relative size change attains a predetermined magnitude or the selected zoom point reaches the central point in the display area.

3.   The method of Claim 1, wherein, when the selected zoom point coincides with the display area central point, the selected zoom point does not translate while its relative size is changing.

4.   The method of Claim 1, further comprising:

while changing the relative size of the selected zoom point, translating at least a portion of the displayed image out of the display area.

Claims 5-7 (canceled).

8.   The method of Claim 1, further comprising:

changing the relative size of the entire displayed image simultaneously with the changing of the relative size of the selected zoom point.

9.   The method of Claim 1, further comprising:

displaying a zoom symbol in the display area that at least partially surrounds the selected zoom point; and

translating the zoom symbol coincident with the translation of the selected zoom point.

10.   The method of Claim 9, further comprising:

displaying a cursor symbol in the display area; and

removing the zoom symbol from the display area when the cursor symbol is moved.

11.   The method of Claim 1, wherein the selected zoom point is translated along the zoom line from an original position to a final position, and wherein the method further comprises:

storing data representative of at least the selected zoom point original position.

12.   The method of Claim 11, further comprising:

translating the selected zoom point along a straight line from the final position to the stored original position when changing the relative size of the selected zoom point in a manner opposite to that which it was originally changed.

13.   The method of Claim 12, wherein the displayed image comprises a plurality of image points, and wherein the method further comprises:

translating each image point from an original position to a final position when changing the relative size of the selected zoom point.

14.   The method of Claim 13, further comprising:

storing data representative of each image point original position.

15.   The method of Claim 14, further comprising:

translating each image point along a straight line from its final position to its stored original position when changing the relative size of the selected zoom point in a manner opposite to that which it was originally changed.

16.   The method of Claim 1, wherein the displayed image includes one or more sections that are not visible within the display area, and wherein the method further comprises:

scrolling the displayed image in one or more directions, whereby the original and final positions of the zoom point and each of the image points are each changed to updated original and final positions;

storing each of the updated positions; and

translating the selected zoom point and each image point along a straight line from its final position to its stored updated original position when changing the relative size of the selected zoom point in a manner opposite to that which it was originally changed.

17.   The method of Claim 1, further comprising:

selecting a new zoom point after changing the relative size of the previously selected zoom point, the new zoom point having an original position and an original zoom line associated therewith,

wherein the new zoom point original position is its position before the relative size of the previously selected zoom point was changed, and

wherein the original zoom line is a straight line that passes through the new zoom point original position and extends between the display area central point and a display area edge point that is closest to the new zoom point.

18.   The method of Claim 17, further comprising:

changing the relative size of the new zoom point while moving the new zoom point to a position it would have occupied had the new zoom point been the previously selected zoom point, and its relative size had been changed and translated along the new zoom point original zoom line.

19.   The method of Claim 17, further comprising:

moving the new zoom point from its present position to a new position on the new zoom point original zoom line; and

changing the relative size of the new zoom point while translating the new zoom point along the new zoom point original zoom line.

20.   The method of Claim 17, further comprising:

moving the new zoom point from its present position to a new position on an average zoom line; and

changing the relative size of the new zoom point while translating the new zoom point along the average zoom line,

wherein the average zoom line corresponds to an average of the new zoom point original zoom line and a new zoom point zoom line, the new zoom point zoom line passing through the new zoom point at its position prior to being enlarged, and extending between the display area central point and the display area edge point that is closest to the new zoom point.

21.   A display device, comprising:

a user interface operable to receive user input and supply one or more command signals;

a display screen having a display area edge that defines an image display area in which a displayed image may be rendered, the displayed image including an edge point located at a point on the display area edge; and

a processor coupled receive the commands from the user interface and operable, in response thereto, to (i) select a zoom point in the displayed image that corresponds to a point in the displayed image that is to be zoomed (ii) change the relative size of the selected zoom point while translating the selected zoom point along a straight zoom line that passes through the selected zoom point and extends between a central point in the display area and the display area edge point and (iii) maintain the position of the image edge point while the relative size of the selected zoom point is changing such that the image edge point remains coincident with the display area edge point.

22.   The system of Claim 21, wherein the processor is further operable to:

inhibit any further change in relative size, and any further translation along the zoom line, when the relative size change attains a predetermined magnitude or the selected zoom point reaches the central point in the display area.

23.   The system of Claim 21, wherein, when the selected zoom point coincides with the display area central point, the selected zoom point does not translate while its relative size is changing.

24.   The system of Claim 21, wherein the processor is further operable to translate at least a portion of the displayed image out of the display area while the relative size of the selected zoom point is changing.

5   Claims 25-27 (canceled).

28.   The system of Claim 21, wherein the processor is further operable to change the relative size of the entire displayed image simultaneously with changing the relative size of the selected zoom point.

10

29.   The system of Claim 21, wherein the processor is further operable to:
       display a zoom symbol in the display area that at least partially surrounds the selected zoom point; and
       translate the zoom symbol coincident with the translation of the selected zoom
15   point.

30.   The system of Claim 29, wherein the processor is further operable to:
       display a cursor symbol in the display area; and
       remove the zoom symbol from the display area when the cursor symbol is moved.

20

31.   The system of Claim 21, wherein the processor is further operable to:

translate the selected zoom point along the zoom line from an original position to a final position, and

store data representative of at least the selected zoom point original position.

32.   The system of Claim 31, wherein the processor is further operable to:

translate the selected zoom point along a straight line from the final position to the stored original position when changing the relative size of the selected zoom point in a manner opposite to that which it was originally changed.

33.   The system of Claim 32, wherein the displayed image comprises a plurality of image points, and wherein the processor is further operable to:

translate each image point from an original position to a final position when the relative size of the selected zoom point is changing.

34.   The system of Claim 33, wherein the processor is further operable to store data representative of each image point original position.

35.   The system of Claim 34, wherein the processor is further operable to translate each image point along a straight line from its final position to its stored original position when changing the relative size of the selected zoom point in a manner opposite to that which it was originally changed.

36.   The system of Claim 21, wherein:

the displayed image includes one or more sections that are not visible within the display area; and

the processor is further operable to:

scroll the displayed image in one or more directions, in response to one or more command signals from the user interface, whereby the original and final positions of the zoom point and each of the image points are each changed to updated original and final positions,

store each of the updated positions, and

translate the selected zoom point and each image point along a straight line from its final position to its stored updated original position when changing the relative size of the selected zoom point in a manner opposite to that which it was originally changed.

37.   The system of Claim 21, wherein:

the processor, in response to the command signals, is further operable to select a new zoom point after the relative size of the previously selected zoom point changed, the new zoom point having an original position and an original zoom line associated therewith;

the new zoom point original position is its position before the relative size of the previously selected zoom point was changed; and

the original zoom line is a straight line that passes through the new zoom point original position and extends between the display area central point and a display area edge point that is closest to the new zoom point.

5   38.   The system of Claim 37, wherein the processor is further operable to change the relative size of the new zoom point while moving the new zoom point to a position it would have occupied had the new zoom point been the previously selected zoom point, and its relative size had been changed and translated along the new zoom point original zoom line.

10

39.   The system of Claim 37, wherein the processor is further operable to:
move the new zoom point from its present position to a new position on the new zoom point original zoom line; and
change the relative size of the new zoom point while translating the new zoom point along the new zoom point original zoom line.

15

40.   The system of Claim 37, wherein:
the processor is further operable to (i) move the new zoom point from its present position to a new position on an average zoom line and (ii) change the relative size of the new zoom point while translating the new zoom point along the average zoom line; and

20

the average zoom line corresponds to an average of the new zoom point original zoom line and a new zoom point zoom line, the new zoom point zoom line passing through the new zoom point at its position prior to being enlarged, and extending

between the display area central point and the display area edge point that is closest to the new zoom point.

41.   In a display including one or more display area edges that define a display area in which at least a portion of an image including a plurality of image points is displayed, a method of changing the relative size of the displayed image, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a zoom point in the displayed image, the zoom point corresponding to a point in the displayed image that is to be zoomed; and

changing the relative size of the selected zoom point while (i) translating the selected zoom point along a straight zoom line that passes through the selected zoom point and extends between a central point in the display area and an edge point on the display area that is closest to the selected zoom point and (ii) maintaining an alignment of the image points with the display area edge that includes the display area edge point to which the zoom line extends.

42.   The method of Claim 41, wherein the displayed image further includes a plurality of non-edge point image points, each non-edge-point image points having a position that coincides with one of the display area edges that does not include the display area edge point, and wherein the method further comprises:

while changing the relative size of the selected zoom point, translating the position of each of the non-edge-point image points out of the display area.

43.   A display device, comprising:

a user interface operable to receive user input and supply one or more command signals;

a display screen having one or more edges that define an image display area in which a displayed image may be rendered; and

a processor coupled receive the commands from the user interface and operable, in response thereto, to (i) select a zoom point in the displayed image that corresponds to a point in the displayed image that is to be zoomed and (ii) change the relative size of the selected zoom point while translating the selected zoom point along a ~~substantially~~ straight zoom line that passes through the selected zoom point and extends between a central point in the display area and an edge point on the display area that is closest to the selected zoom point,

wherein:

the displayed image includes a plurality of image points aligned with the display area edge that includes the display area edge point to which the zoom line extends; and

the processor is further operable to maintain the alignment of each of the image points with the display area edge that includes the display area edge point while the relative size of the selected zoom point is changing.

44.   The system of Claim 43, wherein:

the displayed image further includes a plurality of non-edge point image points, each non-edge-point image points having a position that coincides with one of the display area edges that does not include the display area edge point; and

the processor is further operable to translate the position of each of the non-edge-point image points out of the display area while the relative size of the selected zoom point is changing.

XI. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 has been entered by the Examiner or relied upon by Appellant in the instant appeal beyond that which is already contained in the as-filed application, as is delineated in the Arguments section of this Brief.

XII. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

   As there are no related appeals and interferences, there are also no decisions
rendered by a court or the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences that are related to
5   the instant appeal.